

1905

File No. 36 of 05-01
Serial Nos. 1 to 5.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Police

Part A: Manuscript
for December 1905

Serial Nos. 1 to 3.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Police 11/10/05

NOTES.

File. No 36 4-5-06

FILE HEADING.

Charges incurred in escorting a prisoner from the Bangalore Central Jail to the 1st class Magistrates Court at Bloeset.

From

The Inspector General of Police in M.,

referred
to (1) -

No. $\frac{1215}{114}$

Dated 23.8.05

Received 24.8.05

Diary No. 469

Enclos. 4

Spare Copies.

Serial No. /

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

States that a bill for Rs 4-0-9 for being the cost incurred in escorting a prisoner from Bangalore to the 1st class Mags Court at Bloeset has been objected to be admitted Compts on the ground that it should be charged to the Police Budget & requests that, as no provision is made in the Police Budget for the current year, a provision of Rs 4-0-9 may be made in the Budget pending before Govt.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

The charges incurred in escorting prisoners to give evidence before Courts should be defrayed by the Court issuing the process (vide Rule 9 of the Rules under the Prisoners Testimony Regulation V of 1874 sanctioned under G.O. Notification No 3826/19418 dated the

Serial
No.

17th September 1895. Such charges were sanctioned to be met from the contingencies of the Courts concerned & were being admitted by the Comptroller (vide G. No. 2667-68 / C.S. 221-2 dated the 13th March 1905).

Sub^v May this be pointed out to the Comptroller & his further opinion called for!

Subd. with a draft letter for approval.

SN
31/8/05

Let G. No. 2667-68

3 First, consult the Financial Branch

Branch II.
SN
19/10/05

31.5. Let address be changed to 1905

" The Comptroller's objection is based upon the classification adopted in the first system of accounts. For the head of account under which the cost of works should be shown please see Civil Accounts Code, vol. II. Appendix I (22) No. 113. For the principle governing such classification please see art 100b.

5 As however the practice of debiting these charges to the Courts concerned has been long in vogue, and is based upon an order of government, a reference may, if necessary, be made to the Comptroller before passing final orders.

Serial
No.

6 If it be decided to debit these charges to the head proposed by the Comptroller from the current year a reappropriation has to be made as there is no provision under this head in the current year's budget. As however these charges ~~are~~ are being met from the contingencies of the Courts, it must be assumed that in providing for such contingencies adequate provision ^{to the extent of extent of provision} has been included therein. It is from the provision for the contingencies of the Courts, therefore, that a reappropriation should be made.

J. Sathyanarayana Chetty

4-9-05.

Sns
26/10/05Ld.
5-9-05.

7 The docs already put up may be ~~after~~ joined in the first instance; & final order passed on receipt of the Comptroller's reply —
Ld.
5-9-05

8 Report of B.K. Venkatesa Venkata Sanyal
6.9.1905

Comptroller no. 762 2/8.9.05

Calls for a statement of his reasons, if considering that the charges in question should be to the Police budget under a new head "way charges".

Serial
No. 3

Paper under dis-
posal (2) -

From the Comptroller, No. 1422 dated the
September 1905.

States that the classification of ac-
has closer reference to the department in which
the expenditure occurs than to the object of the
expenditure and hence the change in question
should be adjusted as Police Expenditure, that
there is no object in requiring the Court to defray
expenditure already incurred in the Police Deptt.
that all that is necessary is that the Court
should countersign & pass the bills as a measure
of administrative audit before they are admitted
in his office.

Subd for order. Please see article 1006 of the
Civil Account Code, Vol II, put up for the rule.

SW
15/9/05 7192
15.9.05

9 What is the Madras Rule concerning
to our Rule 9? Put these Rules up 11/10/05

The volume of the Port St George Gazette containing
the rules for the Control of prisoners is put up.
Please see Rules 15 & 16 of the Rules as regarding
regards the payment of charges for conveyance
of prisoners.

Subd. Are there any late rules under Act
III of 1900, which repeals the Act of 1869?

SW
15/9/05

vide Madras Local Rules taken off

Flag S
N.Serial
No.

Submitted.

10 Copies of the rules in force in the Madras Presidency & United Provinces of Oudh & Agra on the subject of the incurring of charges for the escort of prisoners to & from the Courts, are put up ~~as personally directed~~. The Rules in force in other Provinces in British India are not available.

SN
22/10/05 9/11/05
26/9/05

H T.
J L N

11 The Madras rules seem to support the practice hitherto in force in Mysore, and require that "the cost of conveyance of prisoners to and from the Court shall be recovered ^{by} the Officer in charge of the jail" [as opposed to the Officer in the Mysore rules] "from the Court."

12 Under the United Provinces Rules, however, no charge is to be made by the Office Dept., which defrays the whole of the expenses of every kind, but ~~where~~ where a prisoner is summoned without adequate cause by a complainant or defendant, the costs previously deposited may be ^{sent to him} credited by the Office Dept.

13 ~~In Civil cases~~ ^{In Civil cases} under our Regulation V of 1894, the costs & charges of executing the process have to be deposited in Court, which, presumably, pays out the same to the authority that has

Serial
No.

incurred them. Vide section 14-

14 There being such ~~serious~~ conflicting considerations to be borne in mind, it is difficult to accept ~~the~~ unreservedly the Comptroller's view, though the latter may be sound financially. If his view is accepted, the Rules will require modification, especially Rules 8 & 9. Instructions are requested.

15 The Rules of 1905 were proposed for adoption by the Chief ~~Comm~~ Judge, who was also the Dispendary General of Police at the time.

16 In British India the Act in force is the Prisoners Act No III of 1900, which superseded the Prisoners Act of 1849. ~~Delinquency Act~~ ¹⁸⁴⁹ upon which are based.
Sd/-  26/9/05

17 The question is as to who should bear the charges of conveying prisoners from jail to the Courts that summon them. In Cr. cases the charge is paid out of the Contingency of the Court summoning. In civil cases the party that summons pays. The Comptroller says that in Cr. cases the Police Dept. should bear the charge. It is all the same

Serial
No.

who pay (whether the Govt or
the other dept), as the money is
Govt money.

Submitted to the Dewan
Sahib thro the 1st & 2nd Comis
B. H. Venkiah Venkata Rao
27-5-1905

508
29-9-05
Impose

for this remark

The Comptroller
says it does
not admit
of direct
audit

197th involving a ^{more} technical question -
is a financial question -

own opinion is that the present
Rules & practice have not been
known to have caused any incon-
-venience and may be allowed
to stand - etc.

20/9/05

22/9/05
10/10/05

24/10/05

20 The practice followed
known is not peculiar,
to anyone along with
no ~~unwarranted~~ ^{worked} ~~unwarranted~~ ^{worked}
notwithstanding the
technical objections
In my opinion no
change in the existing
rules is called for
A. M. S. M. S.

Serial
No.

21 I am in favour of adopting
the Comptroller's & Asst Secretary's
suggestion. Please pre-arrange
meeting with 13.11.05

22 To the Registrar

for committee

B. K. Ghosh
15.11.05

15.11.05

Committee:

23 The Comptroller's suggestion
may be adopted and the
rules modified accordingly
but in consultation with
the Dy Commr & Dy. of Police
the necessary re-appropriation
should be made by the
Comptroller giving adv. money
to the Police Deptt and
making a corresponding
deduction in the contingent
allowances of Comts out
of which such payments
are at present made.

24. 11.05 with.

Subd. with drafts ~~and~~ ~~directed~~.

9.12.05

18/12/05

18/12/05

Extract from the Proceedings of the 120th Meeting
of the Council of His Highness the Maharaja,
held at Bangalore on the 24th Novr 1905.

IV Subject--(Clause ^{the} VIII of Schedule.)

Proposal of the Comptroller that charges incurred in escorting prisoners to Criminal Courts to give evidence, should be debited to the Police Budget under the head "Way charges of escort", instead of being met from the Contingencies of the Courts concerned as at present.

Opinions of the Dewan and Councillors.

The Comptroller's suggestion may be adopted and the rules published under Notification No 3826 dated 17th Septemb 1895, modified accordingly (J. 418)-

Necessary provision for such expenditure will accordingly be made in future Budgets under "17. Police", and the Contingent allotments of the Courts will be reduced correspondingly. But, for the rest of the Current year, the

Comptroller will, in consultation with District Magistrates and the Inspector General of Police, make the necessary re-appropriation by giving additional money to the Police Department, and making a corresponding deduction in the contingent allowances of Courts out of which such payments are at present made.

(Signed) P. N. Krishna Murthi
- Dewan of Mysore

Mamabhai
1 Secretary
null
12-11-05

Submitted to His Highness.

The question raised in the accompanying papers is essentially one of audit. Under the existing rules and practice, the charges incurred by the Police for escorting prisoners to criminal courts for giving evidence are paid out of the contingencies of the courts. The Comptroller proposed that the charges should be properly debited to the Police Budget under the head "Way charges of escort". The Councillors were at first opposed to the suggested change on the ground that no practical inconvenience had resulted from the existing practice. In the Council meeting, however, a unanimous opinion was arrived at in favour of adopting the Comptroller's suggestion which is calculated to facilitate audit. The opinion of the Council may be approved.

Paper under disposal

Page 7 of office note

6.7.11.35 *und?*

Record of Case submitted for the orders
of His Highness the Maharaja.

Subject.

Alteration of the existing rules in regard
to the Budget provision for meeting charges in-
curred in escorting prisoners to Criminal Courts
to give evidence.

Order.

Approved

KRW

11/12/55

Order and
12.XII.55
12.XII.55

Serial
No.

4.

G.P. No 1755-66 dt 23.12.05

To

The S. of Police
 " Registrar, Chief Court
 " Comptroller
 " District Magistrates.

N. Approves of the Comptroller's suggestion
~~and~~ directs that the charges her debited to the
 Police Budget, necessary provision therefor
 being made in ^{the future budgets of that Dept} ~~that budget~~ and proposes cut
 arrangements ^{in regard to} ~~to meet the~~ for the said char.
 being met by the police Dept during the
 current year.

No 1754 dt 22.12.05

Notifies the modification of the Rules
 for regulating the escort of prisoners to
 & from courts in which their pre-
 sence is ~~necessary~~ required etc,
 which were published under Notn No $\frac{3826}{7418}$
 dt 17.9.1895.

From,

The Inspector General of Police
in Mysore.

To,

The Secretary to the Govt. of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Genl: & Rev: Departments.

Dated. 23^d

Despatched. 23^d August 1905

Received.

General No: 1215
No: 114

Enclosure T

stating that a bill would not be admitted
by the Comptroller on the ground that it should
be charged to the Police Budget & requesting
that a provision of Rs 600/- may be made in the
budget pending before Government.

No: 1215 600 4
1114

Police File No 36 =
Serial No 1
Office of the

~~Inspector General of Police in Mysore.~~

Dated, Bangalore, 23rd August 1905.

F. E. C. Carr Esquire,

Inspector General of Police in Mysore.

To,

B. K. Venkatavaradaiengar Esquire,

Secretary to the Government of

His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

I have the honor to state that a bill for Rs 4-0-9 being the cost incurred in escorting a prisoner from Bangalore Central Jail to the Court of the 1st class Magistrate at Closepet was, in accordance with the order contained in para 9 of Government Proceedings No: 3826/J 418 dated 17th September 1895, given to the Court by the Bangalore District Police. Though countersigned by the Chief Court, the bill has been objected to be audited by the Comptroller on the ground that the expenditure has to be charged to the head "Way charges of escorts" in the Police Budget.

As such charges were hitherto being met from the contingencies of Judicial Courts, no provision has been made in the Police Budget for the current year under the head referred to by the Comptroller.

Should the Government consider that expenditure of the kind referred to is to be met from the Police Budget,

26/1-971 dated 9th May 1905 from the Comptroller to the District
rate, Bangalore.
84/3570 dated 16-6-05 from the Registrar of Chief Court to the Dis-
Magistrate, Bangalore.
dated 11th July 1905 from the District Magistrate, Bangalore, to the
ntendent of Police, Bangalore.
dated 21st July 1905 from the Superintendent of Police to the Ins-
General of Police.

I request that a provision of Rs 600/- may be made in the
Budget which is yet pending before Government.

Copies of the ^{below} ~~manually~~ noted correspondence
are enclosed for information ~~for file~~

/ I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,



Inspector General of Police.

Police
File No. 36.

Serial No. 2.

Diary No. of letter replied to—

Letter No. 7762/Pol: 36-2
Of 8/9/05 In: fine,

General and Revenue Secretariat

(Police)

the 8-9-1905

To

The Comptroller to the Govt of
H.H. the Maharaja
of Mysore.

Date of issue

8-9-05

Signed by

Mr. K.S. Chandra

Deputy Secretary

For

5762

I am directed to forward
herewith a copy of letter No. 1215
dated the 23rd August 1905, from the
Inspector General of Police in Mysore
and its enclosures, in original,
regarding the debiting of the ex-
penditure incurred in seating
prisoners to criminal courts
to fine evidence etc, and to
point out that under rule 7
of the Rules under the Mysore
Police Act, 1904, the

V. of 1894 sanctioned in Govt. Notification

N. 2826/8418 dated the 17th September 1905 Hag T.

95, such changes have to be ~~incurred~~

repaired by the Courts concerned

which issue the processes. The Govt.

are also in one or two cases

directed that ~~the~~ ^{such} changes should be

debit to the Contingencies of the

Govt, ~~which was not objected.~~

2 (vide Govt. order N. 2667-68/C221-2 Hag R

dated the 23rd March 1905).

2. I am to request therefore

that you will be so good as to

forward Govt. with a statement of your reasons, if any,

~~to whether any modification of~~

~~the existing procedure is necessary.~~

for considering that
the charges in question
should be debited to the Office
having a new head in the "Way
charges of Govt." List of enclosures.

I have etc

6.8.1905

1-908 Secretary

Copied by 7/9/05

Examined by SN

31/8/05

From Y.V. Krishna Murty Esquire, B

(Superintendent of Police

Bangalore District.

To C. Madiah Esquire, Rao Bahadur

(Inspector General of Police

in Mysore.

Dated 21st

Despatched 25th July 1905.

Received

General No. 71.

No.

Enclosure No.

Sir,

In forwarding herewith in original the District Magistrate's letter No: J 34 dated 11th July 1905 with its enclosures, I have the honor to state that no provision has been made in the Budget allotment hithert received, under the head "way charge of escort" to meet the heavy charges constantly incurred in paying the prisoners and constables when escorting them from the Central Jail, Bangalore, to different courts in the Province and much inconvenience is felt on account of this. ✓

I therefore request that a sum of ₹600/- may be kindly allotted to this District, under the head "way charges of escort" under V supplies

and services, (3) District Police, for a reference made to Government, to allot the said sum to the Jail authorities, to facilitate the prompt despatch of prisoners under escort, to different courts in the Province.

I have &c.,

(Signed.) Y. V. Krishna Murty.

Superintendent of Police,

Bangalore District.

" C O P Y "



Inspector General of Police.



✓ 190 .

From K.R. Srinivasiengar Esqr, B.A.
Ag. District Magistrate,
Bangalore District.

To Y.V. Krishna Murty Esquire,
Superintendent of Police,
Bangalore District.

Bill for escorting prisoner
Venkatachalam from Bangalore to
Closepet Range Magistrate's Court
for February 1905. #4-0-9.

Dated _____
Despatched 11th July 1905.
Received _____

General No. J 34.
No. _____


Enclosure No. _____

Bill for escorting prisoner
Venkata Raddi from Bangalore City
to Kuppum by Civil and Military
Station Police for February 1905.
received with Memo No: 2803/C.236-1
dated 31-3-05 from Government
#0-11-0.)

Has the honor to forward
herewith for information and needful
action, two bills as per margin and
copies of docket, Nos: 6426/T.A.D.Gr
1-971 dated 9th May 1905 and 6384/3570
dated 20th June 1905 from the Com-
ptroller and the Registrar, Chief Court,
respectively, instructing that such
expenditure has to be debited to the
head "way charges of escorts" under
V supplies and services (3) District
Police and that a reappropriation of
funds to meet the said expenditure
should be made in the Police Depart-
ment.

(Signed.) K.R. Srinivasiengar
Ag. Distt. Magistrate, Bangalore.

" C O P Y "


Inspector General of Police.

Copy of docket No. 6426/T.A.D.Gr. 1-971 dated 9th May 1905 from
the Comptroller, Mysore Government to the District Magistrate,
Bangalore District.

Has the honour to return the bill on account of cost
of escorting certain prisoners from the Central Jail to Closepet
in February 1905 received with his docket No. J.957 dated 10th
April 1905 and to request that he will be so good as to obtain
a reappropriation of funds for meeting the expenditure which has
to be debited to the head "Way charges of escorts" under V sup-
plies and services (3) District Police, on account of which no
provision has been made in the budget.

" C O P Y "

(Signed.) K.R.Srinivasiengar.

Ag. District Magistrate,

Bangalore District.

" C O P Y "



Inspector General of Police.
W.R.

Chief Court of Mysore.

Bangalore, Dated 16/20 th June 1905.

From,

The Registrar of the
Chief Court of Mysore.

To,

The Ag. District Magistrate
Bangalore District.

His docket No: J 1183 dated 14th instant.

With reference to the above has the honor to state that the reappropriation referred to in above, should be made in the Police Department and not by this Court. The papers received with the above are herewith returned.

(Signed.) V.A.Rajaratna Moodaliar.

Registrar.

" C O P Y "

(Signed.) K.R.Srinivasiengar.

Ag. District Magistrate.

" C O P Y "



Inspector General of Police.

File N^o 3.
TREASURY ACCOUNT DEPARTMENT.

2 Inc for
77 OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER, MYSORE GOVT
Bangalore, 11 September 1905
13

From Rai N. G. Basu Bahadur, M.A.,
Comptroller, Mysore Govt.

To
B.K.Venkatavarada Iyengar, Esq.,
Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

9/11/14-8-05)
(Police)
SIB

S No 3

In reply to your letter No.J762/Pol:36-2 dated the 8th September 1905, I have the honour to say that the classification of expenditure in the accounts has closer reference to the department in which the expenditure occurs than to the object of the expenditure. In this case the expenditure is incurred in the Police Department and hence it should be adjusted as Police expenditure. Otherwise the directness of audit processes will be affected and it will be difficult to agree the accounts of disbursing officers with those of the account office.

As far as I can see there is no object in requiring the Courts to defray expenditure already incurred in the Police department; all that is necessary is that the Courts should countersign and pass the bills as a measure of administrative audit ^{before} ~~before~~ they are finally admitted in my office. The defrayal of the expenditure should take place only once and that through the branch of the service that directly and immediately undertakes the work.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

[Signature]

[Signature]
Comptroller.

DEPARTMENT.

1905.

From *Rai M. Ram Bahadur Mi*
The Comptroller, Mysore Govt.

To *M. K. Venkatachandra Srinivas*
The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
General Revenue Dept.

Dated 11

Despatched 13

Received

No. 1422

and No. 277

I Enclosure. four

SUBJECT MATTER.

Referring to his letter No. J-76:
of 8/9/05, dated that there is ^{Vol: 36}
object in requiring the Com
to defray expenditure also
incurred in the Police before
all that is necessary is that
before the Commission & pass
bills as a measure of administration
audit before they are finally adn
in this office.

2 Dmfs

File No. 36

Serial No. 4

Diary No. of letter replied to

GENERAL AND REVENUE
SECRETARIAT.

()

, the

190

Date of issue

23/12/05

Signed by

Mr. B. Kamaswamy
SecretaryProceedings of the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore.

READ.—

S No. 4
Letter no. $\frac{1215}{114}$ dated the 23
August 1905, from the Inspector
General of Police in Mysore,
stating that a bill for Rs 4-0
being the cost of incurred in e
costing a prisoner from the Ban,

~~ORDER THEREON.~~ No.

- from Central Jail to the Court
the First Class Magistrate
Cherpet, though counter-sig-
by the Chief Court, has been
objectio to be audited by the
Comptroller on the ground
the expenditure has to be ch

over

SUBJECT

to the head "Way Charges of escorts
in the Police Budget, ~~that as~~
~~such charges were hitherto being~~
~~met from the contingencies of~~
~~Judicial Courts, no provision~~
~~has been made in the Police~~
~~Budget for the current year~~
~~under the head referred to by~~
~~The Comptroller~~ ^{requesting} and that should
the Govt. consider that expendi-
ture of the kind referred to is
to be met from the Police Budget,
~~that~~ a provision of Rs 600 may
be made in the Budget ~~pending~~
before Government.

2. Letter no. $\frac{1422}{277}$ dated the

11th September 1905, from the

Comptroller ^{to the} Mysore Government,

in reply to this office letter N^o. 9762-M:36-2 d^{td} 8th Sept 1905,
stating that the classification of

expenditure in the accounts has

closer reference to the department

in which the expenditure occurs

than to the object of the expendi-

ture, that otherwise the direction

GENERAL AND REVENUE
SECRETARIAT.

(Continuation Sheet draft form.)

of audit processes will be affected and it will be difficult to agree the accounts of disbursing officers with those of the account office, that there is no object in requiring the courts to defray expenditure already incurred in the Police Department and that the defrayal of the expenditure should take place only once and that through the branch of the service that directly and immediately undertakes the work.

Order thereon - No. J 1755-66

(On a careful consideration of all the circumstances, the Govt. are pleased to approve of the Comptroller's suggestion which is calculated to facilitate audit and they accordingly direct that the charges incurred in escorting prisoners to and from criminal courts for giving evidence be debited to the Police Budget under the head "Way Charges of escort." The necessary provision for such expenditure should be made in the future Budgets under XVII Police, and the contingent allotments of the courts reduced accordingly.

As no such provision has been made in the ^{budget} ~~for this year's~~ the Comptroller will, in consultation with the District Magistrate and the Inspector General of Police, make the necessary re-appropriation by ^{allowing an} ~~giving~~ additional grant ~~money~~ to the Police Department and making a corresponding deduction in the contingent allowances of courts, out of which such payments are at present made.

A notification will be issued separately for introducing the necessary ~~in the~~ ~~the~~ rules published under Govt. Notification no. 3826-J.418. ^{*} Hagt dated the 17th September 1895 will be modified as shown below.

[Here enter notification]

Print

6/20/12/1895

Secretary

20/12/05

The I. G. of Police in Mysore
The Comptroller to Government
The Magistrates of Districts
The I. G. of Prisons in Mysore
The Registrar of the Chief Court
of Mysore.

SN
18/12/05

Copied 22-12-05.

Examined. SN
21/12/05

NOTIFICATION

No. J. 1754—Police 36-5, dated 22nd December 1905.

The Government of His Highness the Maharaja are pleased to direct that the rules framed under section 15 of the Mysore Prisoners' Testimony Regulation, V of 1894 for regulating the escort of prisoners to and from the Court in which their presence is required ~~and~~ fixing the amount to be allowed for the costs and charges of such escort, and promulgated with Government Notification No. 3826—J. 418, dated the 17th September 1895, be modified as follows:—

(1) In rule 8, insert the following in lieu of the last sentence:—

"The cost of dieting prisoners under this rule shall, in cases falling under section 14 of the Regulation, be included in the bill of costs which the Superintendent or Assistant Superintendent of Police presents for payment to the Court issuing the process, and in other cases be borne by the Police Department, which shall present its voucher for the charges to the Court for countersignature."

(2) In rule 9, before the first word "it," insert the words "In cases falling under section 14 of the Regulation."

(3) To rule 9, add the following sentence:—

"In other cases, the cost of escort and of conveyance, if any, under rules 6 and 7, will be borne by the Police Department, which shall present its voucher for the charges of conveyance to the Court for countersignature."

By Order,

B. K. VENKATA VARADA IYENGAR,
Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Dept.

Drps

Notification.

No. J/1754

Police 36-5

Date.

22/12/05

The Govt. of His High-
ness the Maharaja are
pleased to direct that
the rules framed under
section 15 of the Mysore
Prisoners' Testimony
Regulation II of 1894 for
regulating the escort of
prisoners to and from
the court in which their
presence is required and
fixing the amount to
be allowed for the costs
and charges of such
escort and promulgated
with Govt. Notification
no 3826-J418 dated the
17th September 1895, be
modified as follows:-

(1) In rule 8 insert the following
in lieu of the last sentence:-

"The cost of detaining prisoners under
this rule shall, in cases falling under section
14 of the Regulation be included in the
bill of costs which the Superintendent or
Assistant Super^r of Prisons presents for payment
to the Court issuing the process, and in
other cases be borne by the Police depart-
ment, which shall permit its voucher
for the charges to the Court for countersignature.

(2) In rule 9 before the first word "it"
insert the words - "In cases falling
under section 14 of the Regulation".

(3) To rule 9, add the following sentence:-

In rules 8 and 9
the words "for passing &
countersignature" shall
be ~~shall be~~ substituted
for "for payment". The
following sentence shall
be added to rule 9:-

"On receipt of the
bill the charges should
be debited to the

"In other cases the cost of escort,
and of conveyance, if any,
under rules 6 and 7, will be
borne by the Police Department
which shall present its voucher
for the charges of conveyance to
the Court for countersignature"

Police Budget under the
head 'way charges of escort'

By Order

180
20/12/1885

Secretary

180
20/12/1885

To the Compiler, Mysore Gazette, for publication
with Kannada translation
in three successive issues of the Gazette Part III,
and for transmission of 200 spare copies to
the Branch Office.

Copied 22-12-05

Examined. S.H.

20/12/05